

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE VANGUARD CHESTER FUNDS : CIVIL ACTION
LITIGATION :

:
:
: NO. 22-955
:
:

ORDER

AND NOW, this 19th day of March 2025, having considered plaintiffs' and objector John Hughes's arguments in the report of March 18, 2025 (DI 180), it is **ORDERED** that, no later than **March 21, 2025**, plaintiffs shall file a new version of the reply (DI 170) with the designated information redacted from footnote 16. That redacted reply shall also redact any other information that had been designated highly confidential under the protective order (DI 117) unless plaintiffs obtain, or had already obtained, permission from the designating party and/or affected third party pursuant to the terms of the protective order.¹ As for Mr. Hughes's information in footnote 16, while we agree generally with plaintiffs that that *type* of information is not categorically irrelevant, in this case, specifically with regard to considering the merits of Mr. Hughes's objections, the information has been unhelpful. Thus, there is no reason to move to file it under seal. That said, if this order leads to additional redactions, plaintiffs have leave to move to file other such redacted information under seal if they think it worth the candle.


MURPHY, J.

¹ During the recent hearing, when answering questions about the decision to file objector's personal information that had been designated highly confidential on the docket without permission, plaintiffs' counsel said "We do it all the time." DI 181 at 52:23. To be crystal clear: that practice is unacceptable in this court. Further violations may warrant sanctions.